

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 - 2, 4, 6 - 9, and 12 - 17 are currently pending. Claims 1 - 2, 4, and 6 - 9 have been amended. Claims 3, 5, and 10 - 11 have been canceled. Claims 12 - 17 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amended and added claims may be found in the specification as originally filed at page 11, line 16 to page 12, line 17 among other places.

Claims 1, 3, 4/1, 5, 6/1, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Wang et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0168987 [Wang].

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Seppo, U.K. Patent Application No. 2,284,965.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Rignell et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,818,920 [Rignell].

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wang.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wang in view of Sudo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,223,058 [Sudo].

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rignell in view of Sudo.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rignell.

Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Wang as Wang fails to disclose every limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Specifically, Wang fails to disclose "a display unit configured to display the acquired local time if a time zone of the local time for the receiving end differs from a time zone of a local time for the cellular phone, and does not display the acquired local time if the cellular phone and the receiving end are in the same time zone," as recited in amended claim 1.

Wang, as understood, discusses a mobile telephone system having a first mobile telephone and a second mobile telephone. The first mobile telephone is configured to register an "inconvenient time" for which the user of the first mobile telephone does not wish to receive telephone calls. See Wang at paragraphs 25 and 26. The inconvenient time may be registered within the first mobile telephone or may be registered with the first mobile telephone's mobile switching center (or home location register [HLR]). The second mobile telephone is configured to place a telephone call to the first mobile phone. If the second mobile phone places a telephone call to the first mobile telephone during the inconvenient time, then the first mobile telephone is configured to display the local time for the second mobile telephone and present an option to the user of the second mobile telephone to complete the telephone call or cancel the telephone call. Wang's inconvenient times are user set. Nowhere does Wang disclose that inconvenient times include time zones other than the time zone of the second mobile telephone. Further, the second Wang mobile telephone is configured to display a time and ask for confirmation to complete a telephone call based on an inconvenient time and not based on a different time zone. That is, the second Wang mobile telephone displays a time and asks for confirmation to complete a telephone call based on different information than the cellular phone recited in amended claim 1. Moreover, Wang does not disclose displaying or not displaying a local time of the first Wang telephone based on time zones. Therefore, the second Wang mobile telephone is not "configured to display the acquired local time if a time zone of the local time for the receiving end differs from a time zone of a local time for the cellular phone, and does not display the acquired local time if the cellular phone and the receiving end are in the same time zone," as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Wang fails to disclose every limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Wang does not anticipate amended claim 1.

Amended claim 2 recites limitations similar to those of amended claim 1 that were distinguished from Wang above. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that Wang fails to anticipate amended claim 1, Wang also fails to anticipate amended claim 2.

Amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Rignell as Rignell fails to disclose every limitation of amended claim 1. Rignell describes a first telephone configured to place a telephone call to a second telephone. The first telephone is configured to display a local time of

the second telephone and ask for confirmation for call completion if the local time of the second telephone is different from the local time of the first telephone. However, Rignell does not describe not displaying the local time of the second telephone if the local time of the second telephone is the same as the local time of the first telephone. Therefore, Rignell fails to disclose “a display unit configured to display the acquired local time if a time zone of the local time for the receiving end differs from a time zone of a local time for the cellular phone, and does not display the acquired local time if the cellular phone and the receiving end are in the same time zone,” as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Rignell fails to disclose every limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Rignell fails to anticipate amended claim 1.

Amended claim 2 is not anticipated by Rignell as Rignell fails to disclose every limitation of amended claim 2. Specifically, Rignell fails to disclose “a receiver configured to receive position information from a cellular phone that is at a receiving end or a base station” and “a time recognition unit configured to obtain the local time of the receiving end based on the received position information,” as recited in amended claim 2.

Rignell, as understood, describes a first telephone configured to place a telephone call to a second telephone, and is configured to receive the local time (not position information) of the second telephone for display on a display. Rignell fails to describe that the first telephone is configured to receive position information from the second telephone. Further, Rignell fails to describe that the first telephone is configured to determine the local time of the second telephone from received position information. Therefore, Rignell fails to disclose every limitation as recited in amended claim 2. Therefore, Rignell fails to anticipate amended claim 2.

Applicants note that neither Seppo nor Sudo makes up for the deficiencies of either Wang or Rignell as Seppo and Sudo each fail to disclose “a display unit configured to display the acquired local time if a time zone of the local time for the receiving end differs from a time zone of a local time for the cellular phone, and does not display the acquired local time if the cellular phone and the receiving end are in the same time zone,” as recited in amended claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/938,204
Amdt. sent July 14, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2004

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Rodney C. LeRoy
Reg. No. 53,205

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RCL:cm
60241974 v1